

Application No. 09/894,607  
Amendment "B" dated July 12, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed May 19, 2005

### REMARKS

Initially, Applicants would like to thank the examiner for the recent courtesies extended during the in person interview conducted on June 16, 2005. The amendments and remarks made herein are consistent with the proposals and discussions presented during the interview.

This Final Office Action, mailed May 19, 2005, considered and rejected claims 1-14 and 16-34. Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The amendment to claim 16 overcomes this rejection of record by correcting the claim dependency.

Claims 1-7, 24-30 were rejected under U.S.C 35 102(a) as being anticipated by Cohen et al. (US Patent No. 6,178,511). Claims 8, 12-14, 16-19, 22-23, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al., and further in view of Puhl et al. (US Patent No. 6,223,291). Claims 9-11, 31-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al., and further in view of Starkovich et al. (US Patent No. 6,715,080). Claims 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. and Puhl et al. as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Starkovich et al.<sup>1</sup>

By this paper, claims 1, 12, 16 and 24 have been amended, such that claims 1-14 and 16-34 remain pending, of which claims 1, 12 and 24 are the only independent claims at issue.<sup>2</sup>

As discussed during the interview, the cited art fails, alone and in combination, to anticipate or make obvious the claimed invention. In particular, Cohen and the other cited art fail to teach, disclose or otherwise suggest a system or method in which a wireless device accesses a domain at a remote content server upon providing authentication credentials comprising both a domain and username to a WAP server, as claimed. The cited art also fails to disclose that the WAP server forwards the authentication credentials on to a gateway, which maps the authentication credentials based on pre-established criteria, and by changing at least one of the domain and user name. This is particularly true when considering that changing the

<sup>1</sup> Although the prior art status and some of the assertions made with regard to the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicants reserve the right to challenge the prior art status and assertions made with regard to the cited art, as well as any official notice, which was taken in the last response, at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise, such as, for example in a subsequent amendment or during prosecution of a related application. Accordingly, Applicants' decision not to respond to any particular assertions or rejections in this paper should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to said assertions or rejections.

<sup>2</sup> Support for the claim amendments includes the Figures and the corresponding disclosure, including, but not limited to page 19, ll. 18-21.

Application No. 09/894,607  
Amendment "B" dated July 12, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed May 19, 2005

username includes at least one of adding a suffix or prefix to the user name, adding new characters to a middle portion of the user name, replacing a portion of the user name, or deleting some characters from the user name, as recited in the claims. As further recited in the claims, and as further distinguished from the art of record, the mapped authentication credentials are then sent to the network, such that access to the content source is based on the mapped authentication credentials, based at least in part on a changed user name or a changed domain.

Each of the independent claims and, hence, all of the dependent claims, include the limitations recited above.

As discussed in detail during the interview, Cohen in particular, as well as the other art of record, fails to disclose a method or system that includes the forgoing combination of claim elements. Initially, Cohen fails to replace or change a user name or domain received from the client. Instead a (LC) logon coordinator, upon having the user login to a local operating system, queries for new logon information corresponding to the user from a PKM (personal key manager). It then uses this additional logon information to logon to the various different applications and such that the user doesn't have to remember all of the different passwords for the different applications. (Col. 6, ll. 10-29, 56-64; Col. 6, ln. 60-Col. 7, ln. 20.) In fact, Cohen doesn't even receive authentication credentials that include a user name and a domain. Accordingly, it can't change a domain it doesn't receive.

As further discussed, the Cohen (LC) is local and not remotely located, as claimed. Although the PKM can be local, the PKM cannot be confused with the claimed gateway, because the PKM clearly does not send mapped authentication credentials to the network. Instead, Cohen teaches that it is the LC that sends the logon information to the network, based on standard login requirement information retrieved from the (CIM) configuration information manager and the keys and passwords received from the PKM (see Col. 6, ll. 38-42; Col. 7, ll. 11-12.) Accordingly, Cohen doesn't change a received domain. Instead, Cohen's PKM provides the domain information to begin with, as well as the other information required to logon to various applications, based on the user. The LC then uses this information and puts it into PTFs (program template files) provided by the CIM that specify the requirements for logging into the various applications. (Fig 8, Col. 10, ll. 1-6, 31-34).

Finally, although some of the secondary references were cited for teachings regarding a WAP and network communications, the cited art fails to make it obvious to provide a network

Application No. 09/894,607  
Amendment "B" dated July 12, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed May 19, 2005

configuration as recited in the claims, and as shown in the drawings, wherein a wireless device communicates through a WAP server and a separate gateway to access a content server, as claimed, and wherein the gateway communicates with the WAP server and remote content server in the unique manner that is recited in the claims.

For at least these reasons, as well as the others that were discussed during the interview, the cited art was found to be distinguished from the claimed invention. Accordingly, in view of the foregoing, the rejections of record are now moot, such that it is not necessary to address each of the other assertions of record in the last response. Nevertheless, Applicants reserve the right to challenge any of said assertions in the future.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 12 day of July, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER  
Registration No. 28,651  
JENS C. JENKINS  
Registration No. 44,803  
Attorneys for Applicant  
Customer No. 047973

RDN:JCJ:ac  
PPA0000000409V001